arXiv:1302.3426v1 [math.LO] 14 Feb 2013

ORDERED BLACK BOXES: EXISTENCE

SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. We defined ordered black boxes in which for a partial J we try to predict just a bound in J to a function restricted to C_α. The existence results are closely related to pcf, propagating downward. We can start with trivial cases.

Date: December 16, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 03E04,03E75; Secondary: 20K20,20K30.

Key words and phrases. set theory, combinatorial set theory, black boxes, Abelian groups.

The author would like to thank the Israel Science Foundation for partial support of this research (Grant No. 1053/11). The author thanks Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing. First typed April 30, 2012 when moved from [Sh:898] which was first typed Dec. 6, 2006.

§ 0. Introduction

We defined the so-called ordered black box, we use pcf to get many cases of it by downward induction. The starting point is via $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(2^\mu), \mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$. Via such black boxes we get sometime cases of black boxes which are enough, e.g. for the "TDC = the trivial dual conjecture".

This was part of [Sh:898], but in the end the referee requested it to be moved out as it was not used.

We use some definitions from [Sh:898].

§ 1. Propagating $\mathrm{OBB}_\sigma(\bar C)$ down by pcf

We deal here with the ordered black box, OBB and prove in ZFC that many cases occur.

Definition 1.1. 1) For a partial order J, a sequence $\bar C = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ such that $C_\delta \subseteq \delta$ for every $\delta \in S$ and an ideal I on S, let $\mathrm{OBB}_J(\bar C, I)$ mean that there exists a sequence $\langle t_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ with $t_\delta \in J$ such that: if $f : \bigcup\limits_{\delta \in S} C_\delta \to J$, then $\{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f(\alpha) \le_J t_\delta)\} \ne \emptyset \mod I$.
2) If $\sup(S) = \sup(\bigcup\limits_{\delta \in S} C_\delta)$ is a regular uncountable cardinal and I is the non-stationary ideal on λ restricted to S, then we may omit I.
3) If $J = (\theta, <)$, we may write θ instead of J.
4) $\mathrm{OBB}^+_J(\bar C, I)$ is defined as in part (1) but we demand $\{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f(\alpha) \le_J t_\delta)\} = S \mod I$.

Remark 1.2. Note that we can use only I, J and $\lambda(\bar C)$, see below which is a regular cardinal.

Notation 1.3. Let $\bar C = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle, S = S(\bar C)$ and $\mathrm{Dom}(\bar C) := \cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\}$.
1) We may write $\kappa = \kappa(\bar C)$ when $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa$.
2) We may write $\lambda = \lambda(\bar C)$ when $S \subseteq \lambda$ is a stationary subset of the regular uncountable cardinal λ and $[\delta \in S \Rightarrow C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)]$.
3) We may write $\mu = \mu(\bar C)$ when $\mu = \sup \cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\}$ is $< |S(\bar C)|$.
4) We say $\bar C$ is tree-like when $\alpha \in C_{\delta_1} \cap C_{\delta_2} \Rightarrow C_{\delta_1} \cap \alpha = C_{\delta_2} \cap \alpha$.

A (trivial) starting point is

Observation 1.4. *1) If $\lambda = \lambda(\bar C)$ is (well-defined and) regular uncountable and I is the non-stationary ideal restricted to S (which is a stationary subset of λ), see Definition 1.3(2), then $\mathrm{OBB}_\lambda(\bar C, I)$ and moreover $\mathrm{OBB}^+_\lambda(\bar C, I)$.*
2) If $\mathrm{OBB}_J(\bar C, I)$ as exemplified by $\bar t = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ and $\theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta)$ and J is a θ-directed partial order and $I^*_{\bar t} := \{\cup\{A_i : i < i(*)\} : i(*) < \theta$ and for each $i < \theta$ for some $f_i : \cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \to J$ we have $A_i = \{\delta \in S : \neg(\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \le_J t_\delta)\}\}$ then $\mathrm{OBB}^+_J(\bar C, I^*_{\bar t}))$ and $I^*_{\bar t}$ is a θ-complete ideal on $\lambda(\bar C)$.
3) If $\mathrm{OBB}^+_J(\bar C, I)$ and $S_1 \in I^+$ then $\mathrm{OBB}^+_J(\bar C, I + (S\backslash S_1))$, in fact for $J, S, \bar C, I$ as in 1.1, $\mathrm{OBB}^+_J(\bar C, I)$ iff $\mathrm{OBB}_J(\bar C, I + (S\backslash S_1))$ for every $S_1 \in I^+$.

Proof. 1) Let $S = S(\bar C)$. We define $\bar t = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ by letting $t_\delta = \delta$.

Now let $f : \cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \to \lambda$ but $\cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \subseteq \lambda$ so let $f^+ \supseteq f$ be such that $f^+ : \lambda \to \lambda$ (we usually below use just any such f^+).

So $E = \{\delta < \lambda :$ for every $\alpha < \delta$ we have $f^+(\alpha) < \delta\}$ is a club of λ and for every $\delta \in S \cap E$ we have $\alpha \in C_\delta \Rightarrow \alpha < \delta \Rightarrow f(\alpha) < \delta$.

As $S \cap E$ is stationary, we are done.
2) Obviously, $I^*_{\bar t} \subseteq \mathscr{P}(S)$ is closed under subsets, and as θ is infinite regular, clearly $I^*_{\bar t}$ is closed under union of $< \theta$ members, hence $\mathrm{OBB}^+_J(\bar C, I^*_{\bar t})$ holds by the definition 1.1 provided that we show $S \notin I^*_{\bar t}$. So assume $i(*) < \theta, f_i : \cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \to J$ and $A_i := \{\delta \in S \neg(\forall \alpha \in C_\alpha)(f_i(\alpha) \le_J t_\delta)\}$ and we should prove $S \ne \cup\{A_i : i < i(*)\}$. Choose $f : \cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \to J$ by: $f(\alpha)$ is any $\le_J$-upper bound of $\{f_i(\alpha) : i < i(*)\}$, exists as J is θ-directed. Let $A := \{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f(\alpha)) \le t_\delta\}$, so $A \in I^+$ as $\mathrm{OBB}_J(\bar C, I)$ is assumed, so necessarily $A \ne \emptyset$ by the definition of A; as clearly $i < i(*) \Rightarrow A \subseteq A_i$, so we are done.

3) Easy. $\square_{1.4}$

The main case in Lemma 1.5 below is: each J_i is a regular cardinal $> i^*$.

Lemma 1.5. *If clauses (a)-(f) below hold, then for some $\mathscr{U} \in I_*^+$, for every $i \in \mathscr{U}$, we have $\mathrm{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar{C}, I)$, where:*

- (a) $\mathrm{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$ *such that* $S = S(\bar{C}), \kappa = \kappa(\bar{C})$ *or just* $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) \leq \kappa$
- (b) I *is an* $|i^*|^+$*-complete ideal on* S
- (c) $\bar{J} = \langle J_i : i < i^* \rangle$
- (d) J_i *is a partial order such that* $J_i \models (\forall s)(\exists t)(s < t)$
- (e) I_* *is an ideal on* i^*
- (f) (α) J *is a partial order*
  - (β) $\bar{g} = \langle g_t : t \in J \rangle$
  - (γ) $g_t \in \prod_{i<i^*} J_i$ *for* $t \in J$
  - (δ) $\{g_t : t \in J\}$ *is cofinal in* $J_* = (\prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i, \leq_{I_*})$, *where the partial order* $\leq_{I_*}$ *on* $\prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i$ *is defined by* $g' \leq_{I_*} g''$ *iff* $\{i < i^* : g'(i) \leq_{J_i} g'(i)\} = i^* \mod I_*$
  - (ε) $\bar{g}$ *is* $\leq_{I_*}$*-increasing, i.e.,* $s \leq_J t \Rightarrow g_s \leq_{I_*} g_t$,
- (g) *one of the following*[1] *possibilities holds:*

Pos (A): (α) I_* *is* κ^+*-complete or just*

$(\alpha)'$ I_* *is* $|C_\delta|^+$*-complete for every* $\delta \in S$

Pos (B): (α) $\bar{C}$ *is tree-like and* $\mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa$ *for* $\delta \in S$

(β) J_i *is* κ*-directed*

(γ) *if* $\mathscr{U}_\varepsilon \in I_*$ *is* $\subseteq$*-increasing for* $\varepsilon < \kappa$ *then* $i^* \setminus \cup \{\mathscr{U}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\} \notin I_*$

Pos (C): there is $\mathbf{F} : \prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i \to J$ *satisfying* $f \leq_{I_*} g_{\mathbf{F}(f)}$ *for every* $f \in \prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i$ *and if* $f_\varepsilon \in \prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i$ *and* $\mathbf{F}(f_\varepsilon) \leq_J t$ *for* $\varepsilon < \kappa$, *then* $\{i < i^* : f_\varepsilon(i) \leq_{J_i} g_t(i)$ *for every* $\varepsilon < \kappa\} \neq \emptyset \mod I_*$

Pos (D): Clauses $(\alpha), (\beta)$ *as in Pos (B), and*

(γ) *if* $r_\zeta \leq_J t$ *for* $\zeta < \kappa$, *then* $\{i < i^* : g_{r_\varepsilon}(i) \leq_{J_i} g_t(i)$ *for every* $\varepsilon < \kappa\} \neq \emptyset \mod I_*$

Pos (E): Clause (α) *as in Pos (B) and*

(β) $\mathbf{F}_\varepsilon : {}^{\varepsilon+1}(\prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i) \to J$ *for* $\varepsilon < \kappa$ *such that if* $f_\zeta \in \prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i$ *and* $t_\zeta = \mathbf{F}_\zeta(\langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \zeta \rangle)$ *and* $t_\zeta \leq_J t$ *for* $\zeta < \kappa$ *then* $\{i < i^* : (\forall \varepsilon < \kappa)(f_\varepsilon(i) \leq_{J_i} g_t(i)\} \neq \emptyset \mod I_*$ *and* $f_\zeta \leq_{J_*} g_{t_\zeta}$.

Remark 1.6. 1) In Pos(A) of 1.5, when clause (α) holds we get $\mathscr{U} = i^* \mod I$.

---

[1] we may label this $(f)(\zeta)$ rather than (g), but as it is much bigger we prefer the present form

Proof. Let $B = \cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S(\bar{C})\}$.

Let $\bar{t} = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ witness $\mathrm{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$. For each $i < i^*$, we consider $\bar{s}^i := \langle g_{t_\delta}(i) : \delta \in S\rangle \in {}^S(J_i)$. We denote the δ-th member of $\bar{s}^i$ by s^i_δ, so $s^i_\delta = g_{t_\delta}(i)$ for $i < i^*$ and $\delta \in S$.

Let

$(*)_1$ $\mathscr{U}_0 := \{i < i^* : \bar{s}^i \text{ is a witness for } \mathrm{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar{C}, I)\}$.

It suffices to prove

$(*)_2$ $\mathscr{U}_0 \notin I_*$

[Why? Obviously.]

Now for each $i \in \mathscr{U}_1 := i^* \backslash \mathscr{U}_0$ let $f_i : B \to J_i$ exemplify that $\bar{s}^i$ is not a witness for $\mathrm{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar{C}, I)$, i.e.,

$(*)_3$ if $i \in i_* \backslash \mathscr{U}_0$ then $W_i = \emptyset \mod I$ where $W_i := \{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \leq_{J_i} s^i_\delta)\}$.

If $i \in \mathscr{U}_0$, choose any $f_i : B \to J_i$.

Now

$(*)_4$ $W := \cup\{W_i : i \in \mathscr{U}_1\} \in I$.

[Why? By clause (b) of the assumption, the ideal I is $|i^*|^+$-complete.]

Now we choose for each $\alpha \in B$ a function h_α as follows:

$(*)_5$ (a) $h_\alpha \in \prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i$

(b) $i < i^* \Rightarrow f_i(\alpha) \leq_{J_i} h_\alpha(i)$

(c) if ($\bar{C}$ is tree-like and each J_i is κ-directed),
then $h_\alpha(i)$ is a common $\leq_{J_i}$-upper bound of $\{f_i(\alpha)\} \cup \{h_\beta(i)$: there is $\delta \in S$ such that $\alpha \in C_\delta \wedge \beta \in C_\delta \cap \alpha\}$;
so $\langle h_\alpha(i) : \alpha \in C_\delta\rangle$ is $\leq_{J_i}$-increasing for each $\delta \in S$.

[Why does such an h_α exist? If the assumption of $(*)_5(c)$ fails, we let $h_\alpha(i) = f_i(\alpha)$. If the assumption of $(*)_5(c)$ holds, then (for $\alpha \in B, i < i^*$) the set $\{f_\beta(i) : \beta = \alpha$ or $(\exists \delta \in S)(\alpha \in C_\delta \wedge \beta \in C_\delta \cap \alpha)\}$ has cardinality $< \kappa$ because $\bar{C}$ is tree-like and has a common $\leq_{J_i}$-upper bound since J_i is κ-directed and let $h_\alpha(i)$ be any such bound.]

So for $\alpha \in B$, we have $h_\alpha \in \prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i$, and hence by clause $(f)(\delta)$ of the assumption, we can choose $s_\alpha \in J$ such that:

$(*)_6$ (a) $h_\alpha \leq_{I_*} g_{s_\alpha}$, i.e.,
$\mathscr{U}^0_\alpha := \{i < i^* : \neg(h_\alpha(i) \leq_{J_i} g_{s_\alpha}(i))\} \in I_*$

(b) in Pos(C), $s_\alpha := \mathbf{F}(h_\alpha)$

(c) in Pos(E), if $\alpha \in C$ and $\zeta < \kappa$ letting $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \zeta\rangle$ list $C_\delta \cap (\alpha + 1)$,
for any $\delta \in S$ such that $\alpha \in C_\delta$, we have
$s_\alpha = \mathbf{F}_\zeta(\langle h_{\alpha_\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \zeta\rangle)$.

Note that the demands in clauses (b),(c) of $(*)_6$ are compatible with the demand in clause (a) of $(*)_6$.

So $\alpha \mapsto s_\alpha$ is a function from $B = \bigcup\limits_{\delta \in S} C_\delta$ to J, but $\langle t_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ was chosen exemplifying $\mathrm{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$, hence

$(*)_7$ $W_* := \{\delta \in S : \text{if } \alpha \in C_\delta, \text{ then } s_\alpha \leq_J t_\delta\}$ belongs to I^+.

Recalling that $W = \cup\{W_i : i \in \mathscr{U}_1\} \in I$, clearly $W_* \nsubseteq W$, hence we can choose $\delta(*)$ such that

$(*)_8$ $\delta(*) \in W_* \backslash W$.

Now

$(*)_9$ if $\alpha \in C_{\delta(*)}$, then $\mathscr{U}^1_{\delta(*),\alpha} := \{i < i^* : h_\alpha(i) \leq_{J_i} g_{t_{\delta(*)}}(i)\} = i^* \bmod I_*$.

[Why? Because for each $\alpha \in C_{\delta(*)}$ in the partial order $J_* := (\prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i, \leq_{I_*})$, we have $h_\alpha \leq_{I_*} g_{s_\alpha}$ by the choice of s_α, i.e. by $(*)_6$ so $\{i < i^* : h_\alpha(i) \leq g_{s_\alpha}(i)\} = i^*$ mod I_*. Also $s_\alpha \leq_J t_{\delta(*)}$ because $\delta(*) \in W_*$ see $(*)_7 + (*)_8$ hence $g_{s_\alpha} \leq_{I_*} g_{t_{\delta(*)}}$ by clause $(f)(\varepsilon)$ of the assumption and by clause $(f)(\delta)$ this means that $\{i < i^* : g_{s_\alpha}(i) \leq_{J_i} g_{t_{\delta(*)}}(i)\} = i^*$ mod I_*. Together, the last two sentences give $(*)_9$.]

The proof now splits according to the relevant part of clause (g) of the assumption.

Case 1: Pos A:

Now I_* is κ^+-complete (or just $|C_{\delta(*)}|^+$-complete), by clause (α) (or clause $(\alpha)'$) of Pos(A) so necessarily (by $(*)_9$).

$$(*)_{10} \quad \mathscr{U}_* := \bigcap_{\alpha \in C_{\delta(*)}} \mathscr{U}^1_{\delta(*),\alpha} = i^* \mod I_*.$$

Now if $i \in \mathscr{U}_* \backslash \mathscr{U}_0$, then recall that $f_i : B \rightarrow J_i$ exemplifies that $\bar{s}^i$ is not a witness for $\mathrm{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar{C}, I)$ and W_i is well-defined and a subset of W, hence $\delta(*) \notin W_i$ and $\delta(*) \notin W$ by its choice; hence for some $\alpha_i \in C_\delta$, we have $\neg(f_i(\alpha_i) \leq_{J_i} s^i_\delta)$. But this means that $i \notin \mathscr{U}^1_{\delta(*),\alpha_i}$ which by $(*)_{10}$ implies $i \notin \mathscr{U}_*$, a contradiction. We conclude

$(*)_{11}$ $\mathscr{U}_* \subseteq \mathscr{U}_0$.

So by $(*)_{10} + (*)_{11}$, we have proved $(*)_2$ which, as noted above, is sufficient for proving the Lemma 1.5 when Pos(A) hold; this even gives more.

Case 2: Pos(B)

Why? Note that by clauses $(\alpha), (\beta)$ of Pos(B), clause (c) of $(*)_5$ apply. So for each $i < i^*$, by $(*)_5(c)$ the sequence $\langle h_\alpha(i) : \alpha \in C_{\delta(*)}\rangle$ is $\leq_{J_i}$-increasing. Hence by $(*)_9$ the sequence $\langle \mathscr{U}^1_{\delta(*),\alpha} : \alpha \in C_{\delta(*)}\rangle$ is $\subseteq$-decreasing and so $\langle i^* \backslash \mathscr{U}^1_{\delta(*),\alpha} : \alpha \in C_{\delta(*)}\rangle$ is a $\subseteq$-increasing sequence of members of I_* hence by clause (γ) of Pos(B), the set $\mathscr{U}_* := \cap\{\mathscr{U}^1_{\delta,\alpha} : \alpha \in C_{\delta(*)}\}$ is $\neq \emptyset$ mod I_*. Now we repeat the proof in Case 1 after $(*)_{10}$ finishing the proof of Lemma 1.5 when Pos(B) holds.

Case 3: Pos(C)

This is easier.

Case 4: Pos(D)

By clauses $(\alpha), (\beta)$ of Pos(D) the assumption of clause (c) of $(*)_5$ holds hence its conclusion. We continue as in Case 2.

Case 5: Pos(E)

Easy. $\square_{1.5}$

Conclusion 1.7. *Assume that $\mu > \mathrm{cf}(\mu) = \sigma, \mu > \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \neq \sigma$, and J is an ideal on σ which is σ-complete (or just $\sigma > \kappa \Rightarrow J$ is κ^+-complete).*
1) If $\mu < \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) < \mathrm{pp}^+_J(\mu), S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ is stationary, and $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ is a strict (λ,κ)-ladder system, tree-like when $\sigma > \kappa$, then for unboundedly many regular $\theta < \mu$, we have $\mathrm{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$.
2) Assume that for each regular $\lambda \in (\mu, \mathrm{pp}^+_J(\mu)), S_\lambda \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ is stationary and $\bar{C}^\lambda = \langle C^\lambda_\delta : \delta \in S_\lambda\rangle$ is a strict (λ,κ)-ladder system which is tree-like when $\sigma > \kappa$. Then for some $\mu_0 < \mu$, for every regular $\theta \in (\mu_0,\mu)$, for some λ we have $\mu < \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) < \mathrm{pp}^+_J(\mu)$ and $\mathrm{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C}^\lambda)$.

Proof. 1) By the "No hole Conclusion", [Sh:g, Ch.II,2.3,pg.53] there is a sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < \sigma\rangle$ of regular cardinals such that $\mu = \lim_J \langle \lambda_i : i < \sigma\rangle$ and $\lambda = \mathrm{tcf}(\prod\limits_{i<\sigma} \lambda_i, <_J)$; let $\langle g_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ exemplify this. We shall apply 1.5, Pos(A) if $\sigma > \kappa$, Pos(B) if $\sigma < \kappa$ with $\sigma, J^{\mathrm{nst}}_\lambda \restriction S, J^{\mathrm{bd}}_{\lambda_i}$, (for $i < \sigma$), $J, (\lambda, <), \langle g_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ here standing for i^*, I, J_i (for $i < i^*$), $I_*, J, \langle g_t : t \in J\rangle$ there.

Note that clause (a) of the assumption of 1.5 says that $\mathrm{OBB}_\lambda(\bar{C}, J^{\mathrm{nst}}_\lambda \restriction S)$, it holds by Observation 1.4(1); the other assumptions of Lemma 1.5 are also obvious. So its conclusion holds, i.e., $\{i < \sigma : \mathrm{OBB}_{\lambda_i}(\bar{C})\}$ belongs to J^+.

Therefore, since $\mu = \lim_J\langle \lambda_i : i < \sigma\rangle$, clearly $\mu = \sup\{\lambda_i : i < \sigma$ and $\mathrm{OBB}_{\lambda_i}(\bar{C})\}$ as required.
2) Similarly. $\square_{1.7}$

Note that useful to combine the following older results with 1.7 is:

Observation 1.8. *In 1.7, assuming $\mu < \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) < \mathrm{pp}^+_J(\mu)$.*
1) We can find a stationary $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ such that $S \in \check{I}[\lambda]$.
2) For any stationary $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ from $\check{I}[\lambda]$ there are a club E of λ and a strict (λ,κ)-ladder system $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \cap E\rangle$ which is tree-like.

Proof. 1) By [Sh:420, §1] there is such S.
2) By [Sh:420, §1] there is a strict S-ladder system $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ which is tree-like. $\square_{1.8}$

Conclusion 1.9. *Assume $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\sigma, \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \in \mathrm{Reg} \cap \mu \backslash \{\sigma\}$ and for every $\lambda \in \mathrm{Reg} \cap (2^\mu)^+ \backslash \mu$ the sequence $\bar{C}_\lambda := \langle C^\lambda_\delta : \delta \in S_\lambda\rangle$ is a (λ,κ)-ladder system.*

Assume $\kappa < \sigma$ or $\sigma < \kappa < \mu$ and each $\bar{C}_\lambda$ is tree-like.
1) For every large enough regular $\theta < \mu$ we have $\mathrm{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C}_\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathrm{Reg} \cap (\mu, 2^\mu]$.
2) If $\kappa < \sigma$ and $\lambda \in [\mu, 2^\mu] \cap \mathrm{Reg}$ then for arbitrarily large $\theta \in \mathrm{Reg} \cap \mu$ we have $\mathrm{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C}_\lambda)$.

Proof. By 1.7. $\square_{1.9}$

Question 1.10. 1) On entangled linear orders see [Sh:462], existence is proved in some μ^+, but it remains open whether we can demand $\mu = \mu^{\aleph_0}$; is the present work helpful?
2) If $\mathscr{P} \subseteq {}^\omega\lambda, \mu \leq \lambda \leq 2^\mu$ and $|\mathscr{P}| \leq \lambda$, can we partition $\mathscr{P}$ to "few" $\aleph_\omega$-free sets? What if we add $2^\mu = \lambda = 2^{<\lambda} = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$?

* * *

Claim 1.11. *1) Assume*

- (a) $\mathrm{OBB}^+_J(\bar C, I)$ *and*[2] $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > |C_\delta|$ *for* $\delta \in S := S(\bar C)$
- (b) I *is* $(2^{|i^*|})^+$*-complete*
- (c) $\bar J = \langle J_i : i < i^* \rangle$
- (d) J_i *is a partial order such that* $J_i \models \forall s \exists t (s < t)$
- (e) I_* *is a* κ*-complete ideal on* i^*
- (f) (α) J *is a partial order*
  - (β) $\bar g = \langle g_t : t \in J \rangle$
  - (γ) $g_t \in \prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i$
  - (δ) $s <_J t \Rightarrow g_s <_{I_*} g_t$
- (g) *if* $g^\varepsilon \in \prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i$ *for* $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^* < \kappa$, *then for some* $A \in I^+_*$ *and for each* $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^*$, *for some* $t \in J$, *we have* $g^\varepsilon \restriction A <_{I_* \restriction A} g_t \restriction A$.

Then $\{i < i^* : \mathrm{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar C, I)\} \neq \emptyset \mod I_*$.
2) If clause (a) above holds for $I_* \restriction A_0$ *for any* $A_0 \in I^+_*$, *then we can strengthen the conclusion to* $\{i < i^* : \mathrm{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar C, I)\} = i^* \mod I_*$.

Proof. 1) We start to repeat the proof of 1.5. Let $\bar t = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ witness $\mathrm{OBB}^+_J(\bar C, I)$.

Let $\mathscr{U}_1 = \{i < i^* : \bar s^i := \langle g_{t_\delta}(i) : \delta \in S \rangle \in {}^S(J_i)$ is not a witness for $\mathrm{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar C, I)\}$ and for $i < i(*)$ let $f_i : \mathrm{Dom}(\bar C) \to J_i$ exemplify $\neg\mathrm{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar C, I)$ if $i \in \mathscr{U}_1$; hence clearly $\langle f_i(\alpha) : i < i^* \rangle \in \prod\limits_{i<i^*} J_i$ for $\alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar C)$. So $i \in \mathscr{U}_1 \Rightarrow W^i := \{\delta \in S : (\exists \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \nleq g_{t_\delta}(i)\} = S \mod I$.

Toward contradiction assume that $\mathscr{U}_1 = i^* \mod I_*$.

For each $A \in I^+_*$ we choose $h_A : \mathrm{Dom}(\bar C) \to J$ such that:

$(*)_1$ for $\alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar C)$, if there is $t \in J$ such that $\langle f_i(\alpha) : i \in A \rangle <_{I_* \restriction A} (g_t \restriction A)$, then $\langle f_i(\alpha) : i \in A \rangle <_{I_* \restriction A} g_{h_A(\alpha)}$.

For each $A \in I^+_*$, by the choice of $\bar t$ we know that $W_A := \{\delta \in S :$ for every $\alpha \in C_\delta$, $h_A(\alpha) \leq_J t_\delta\} = S \mod I$.

But the ideal I is $(2^{|i^*|})^+$-complete by clause (b) of the assumption, hence $W := \cap\{W_A : A \in I^+_*\} \cap \{W^i : i \in \mathscr{U}_1\} = S \mod I$. Now for any $\delta \in W$, consider $\langle\langle f_i(\alpha) : i < i^* \rangle : \alpha \in C_\delta \rangle$; it is a sequence of $< \kappa$ members of ${}^{i^*}J$; hence by clause (f) for some $A \in I^+_*$, each $\langle f_i(\alpha) : i < i^* \rangle \restriction A$ has a bound belonging to the set $\{g_t \restriction A : t \in J\}$ in $(\prod\limits_{i \in A} J_i, <_{I_* \restriction A})$.

So by $(*)_1$ we have $\alpha \in C_\delta \Rightarrow \langle f_i(\alpha) : i \in A \rangle <_{I_* \restriction A} g_{h_A(\alpha)}$. But $\delta \in W \subseteq W_A$, hence $h_A(\alpha) \leq_J t_\delta$, which implies that $g_{h_A(\alpha)} \leq_{I_*} g_{t_\delta}$. So $\alpha \in C_\delta \Rightarrow \langle f_i(\alpha) : i \in A \rangle \leq_{I_* \restriction A} g_{h_A(\alpha)} <_{I_*} g_{t_\delta}$. However, I_* is κ-complete by clause (e) and $|C_\delta| < \kappa$, hence $B := \{i \in A : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) <_{J_i} g_{t_\delta}(i)\} = A \mod I_*$.

As $\mathscr{U}_1 = i^* \mod I_*$ and $A \in I^+_*$ clearly $\mathscr{U}_1 \cap A \in I^+_*$, so $\mathscr{U}_1 \cap A \neq \emptyset$. But letting $i \in A \cap \mathscr{U}_1$, we get a contradiction to the assumption that f_i exemplifies $\neg\mathrm{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar C, I)$, more exactly W is thin enough, i.e., $W \subseteq W^i$ for $i \in \mathscr{U}_1$.

2) Easy. $\square_{1.11}$

---

[2] using C_δ's of constant cardinality is a loss but only if κ is a limit cardinal.

Claim 1.12. *If* $\lambda_n = \text{cf}(2^{\mu_n}), 2^{\mu_n} < \mu_{n+1}$ *for* $n < \omega$ *and* $(\forall \alpha < 2^{\mu_n})(|\alpha|^{\aleph_1} < 2^{\mu_n}), \chi < \mu = \Sigma\{\mu_n : n < \omega\} \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_0}$ *and* $\lambda \in \text{pcf}\{\lambda_n : n < \omega\} \backslash \mu)$ *(maybe* J *is an* $\aleph_1$*-complete ideal on* κ*)* then $\text{BB}(\lambda, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \chi, J_{\omega_1 * \omega})$ *recalling* [Sh:898, Definition 0.5=0p.14].
2) Similarly replacing ω *by* σ*, so* $\aleph_1$ *by* σ^+*.*

Remark 1.13. 1) On $J_{\omega_1 * \omega}$ see [Sh:898, 0.3=0p.6(3)].
2) If $\{\mu : (\forall \alpha < 2^\mu)(|\alpha|^{\aleph_1} < 2^\mu)\}$ is uncountable the claim apply, i.e. its assumption holds for some $\langle(\mu_n, \lambda_n) : n < \omega\rangle, \mu, \lambda$.

Proof. 1) By part (2) using $\sigma = \aleph_0$.
2) Note

- $(*)_1$ without loss of generality $\chi = \chi^{\sigma^+} < \mu_i$ for every $i < \sigma$.

[Why? First $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\sigma$, clearly $\sigma < \mu$ and $\chi < \mu \Rightarrow 2^\chi < \mu \Rightarrow \chi^{\sigma^+} < \mu$; so we can replace χ by χ^{σ^+}. Second, let $i(*) = \min\{i : \mu_i > \chi\}$ and replace $\langle \mu_i : i < \sigma\rangle$ by $\langle \mu_{i(*)+i} : i < \sigma\rangle$.]

- $(*)_2$ let $\langle f^i_\alpha : \alpha < 2^{\mu_i}\rangle$ list ${}^{(\mu_i)}\chi$
- $(*)_3$ choose a sequence $\bar{g}_i = \langle g^i_\beta : \beta < 2^{\mu_i}\rangle$ of members of ${}^{\mu_i}({}^\sigma\chi)$ such that: if $\beta < \lambda_i$ and $\gamma_j < \beta$ for $j < \sigma$ then for some $\varepsilon < \mu_i$ we have $g'_\beta(\varepsilon) = \langle f^i_{\gamma_j}(\varepsilon) : j < \sigma\rangle$.

[Why? As $\alpha < 2^{\mu_i} \Rightarrow |\alpha|^\sigma < 2^{\mu_i}$ and $\chi = \chi^\sigma$ by renaming it suffices to prove: if $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^{(\mu_i)}\chi$ has cardinality $< 2^{\mu_i}$ then for some $g \in {}^{\mu_i}\chi$ we have $(\forall f \in \mathscr{F})(\exists \varepsilon < \mu_i)(f(i) = g(i))$.

As $\mu_i \in \mathbf{C}_\sigma$ this is as in [Sh:775] or §2 here; that is we can find $\bar{f} = \langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu_i\rangle$ exemplifying $\text{Sep}(\mu_i, \chi, (2^\chi)^+)$ which holds by [Sh:898, 2.6=d.6(d)]. Now choose $g \in {}^{(\mu_i)}\chi \backslash \cup \{\text{Sol}_\varrho : \varrho \in \mathscr{F}\}$, where $\text{Sol}_\varrho := \{\nu \in \chi :$ if $\varepsilon < \mu_i$ then $\varrho(\varepsilon) = f_\varepsilon(\nu)\}$ as in $(*)_0$ in the proof of [Sh:898, 2.6=d.6]; there is such g as $|\text{Sol}_\varrho| < (2^\chi)^+$ for every $\varrho \in {}^{(\mu_i)}\chi$.]

- $(*)_4$ without loss of generality $\lambda := \text{tcf}(\prod\limits_{i<\sigma} \lambda_i, <_{J^{\text{bd}}_\sigma})$ is well defined.

[Why? By the pcf theorem there is an unbounded $u \subseteq \sigma$ such that $\text{tcf}(\prod\limits_{i \in u} \lambda_i, <_{J^{\text{bd}}_u})$ is well defined; now rename.]

- $(*)_5$ if $\lambda < 2^\mu$ then we get the conclusion.

[Why? By Definition [Sh:898, 1.1=1.3.1] and [Sh:898, 1.3=1.3.3(c)] there is a μ^+-free $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^\sigma\mu$ of cardinality λ. Hence by [Sh:898, 1.8 = 1f.13(2A)] for any stationary $S \subseteq S^\lambda_{\sigma^+}$ we can choose an S-ladder system $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ which is $(\mu^+, J_{\sigma^+ * \sigma})$-free. So by 1.5, $\text{OBB}_{\lambda_i}(\bar{C}_1)$ holds for every $i < \sigma$ large enough recalling Definition 1.1(2). By $(*)_3$ and Theorem 1.14 below we can get the conclusion.]

- $(*)_6$ if $\lambda = 2^\mu$ then we get the conclusion.

[Why? Now by [Sh:898, 1.26=2b.111] we can find stationary $S \subseteq S^\lambda_{\sigma^+}$ and a $(\sigma^{+(\sigma+1)}, J_{\sigma^+ * \sigma})$-free S-ladder system. We finish similarly to $(*)_5$ but here we use $\alpha < 2^{\mu_i} \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{\sigma^+} < 2^{\mu_i}$.] $\square_{1.12}$

Theorem 1.14. *1) We have* $\mathrm{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, \theta, \kappa)$ *when:*

- (a) $\mathrm{OBB}_\chi(\bar{C}, I), I$ *is* μ^+*-complete*
- (b) $\kappa(\bar{C}) = \kappa$
- (c) $\chi = \mathrm{cf}(2^\mu)$ *and* $\theta < \mu$
- (d) $\alpha < 2^\mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^\kappa < 2^\mu$
- (e) $\mathrm{Sep}(\mu, \theta)$*, see Definition* [Sh:898, 2.1=d.8(2)].

2) Moreover in part (1) we get $\mathrm{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, (2^\mu, \theta), \kappa)$.
3) Similarly replacing (d) by

- $(d)'$ $\bar{C}$ *is tree-like and* $\alpha < 2^\mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{<\kappa>_{\mathrm{tr}}} < 2^\mu$.

Proof. 1) By (2).
2),3) Let $\bar{t} = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S(\bar{C})\rangle \in S(\bar{C})_\theta$ witness $\mathrm{OBB}_\chi(\bar{C})$.

We now repeat the proof of [Sh:775, 1.10] or of [Sh:898, 2.2=d.6] here using t_δ instead of δ for $\delta \in S$. $\square_{1.14}$

Discussion 1.15. On 1.14:
1) We use the obvious decomposition $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \chi\rangle$ of ${}^\mu\theta$. There may be others.
2) We may replace "$\chi = \mathrm{cf}(2^\mu)$" by $\chi = \lambda = \min\{\lambda : 2^\lambda > 2^\mu\}$ as in §2.
3) We may phrase the condition on $\mathbf{F} : {}^\mu\theta \to \Upsilon$ not only when $\Upsilon = \mathrm{cf}(\theta^\mu)$.
4) Like (3) but for our specific problem: $\mathrm{Hom}(G, \mathbb{Z}) = \{0\}$.

* * *

We look at another way to get cases of OBB. Recall the definition of $\mathfrak{d}^{<\sigma}_{\theta,\mathfrak{d}^\sigma_\theta}$ from Matet-Roslanowski-Shelah [MRSh:799, 1.1] which proves this number can; i.e. consistently, have cofinality $\aleph_0$ and be $< \mathfrak{d}_\theta$; not used in the rest of the paper.

Definition 1.16. Assume $\mu \ge \theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) \ge \sigma$ and I an ideal on μ (so by our notation determine μ).
1) Let $\mathfrak{d}_{I,\theta,<\sigma}$ be $\min\{|\mathscr{F}| : \mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^\mu\theta$ has no (I,σ)-bound$\}$ where
2) We say that $g \in {}^\mu\theta$ is a (I,σ)-bound of $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^\mu\theta$ when for any $\mathscr{F}' \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ of cardinality $<\sigma$ for I^+-many $\varepsilon < \mu$ we have $(\forall f \in \mathscr{F}')(f(\varepsilon) < g(\varepsilon))$.
3) Let $\mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{inc}}_{I,\theta,\sigma}$ be defined similarly but $\mathscr{F}' = \{f_i : i < \sigma\}$ with the sequence $\langle f_i : i < \sigma\rangle$ being $<_{J^{\mathrm{bd}}_\kappa}$-increasing.
4) Let $\mathfrak{D}_{I,\theta,\sigma}$ be the set of regular $\chi > \theta$ such that there is a $\subsetneq$-increasing sequence $\langle \mathscr{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi\rangle$ of subsets of ${}^\mu\theta$ such that: $\mathscr{F}_\varepsilon$ has a $(I,<\sigma)$-bound for $\varepsilon < \chi$ and $\cup\{\mathscr{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi\} = {}^\mu\theta$.
5) Let $\mathfrak{D}^{\mathrm{seq}}_{I,\theta,\sigma} = \min\{|\mathscr{F}| : \mathscr{F} \subseteq \cup\{{}^\iota({}^\mu\theta) : \iota < \sigma\}$ has no $(I,<\sigma)$-bound $g\}$ where
6) g is a $(I,<\sigma)$-bound of $\mathscr{F} \subseteq \cup\{{}^\iota({}^\mu\theta) : \iota < \sigma\}$ when $g \in {}^\mu\theta$ and if $\bar{g}' = \langle g_\iota : \iota < \sigma\rangle$ and $\iota < \sigma \Rightarrow \bar{g}' \restriction \iota \in \mathscr{F}$ then for I^+-many $\varepsilon \le \mu$ we have $\iota < \sigma \Rightarrow g_\iota(\varepsilon) \le g(\varepsilon)$.
7) If I is the ideal $\{\emptyset\}$ on μ then we may write μ instead of I; omitting μ (and I) means $\mu = \theta \wedge I = J^{\mathrm{bd}}_\theta$.

Definition 1.17. We define $\mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{eq}}_{I,\theta,\sigma}$, etc. when $\le$ is replaced by $=$.

Claim 1.18. *1) Assume $\theta > \kappa$ are regular cardinals and $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta,\kappa}) > \theta$. If $\bar{C}$ is a (λ,κ)-ladder system then $\mathrm{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$ (and $\lambda > \theta$).*
2) Assume $\theta > \kappa$ are regular and $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{seq}}_{\theta,\kappa}) > \theta$. If $\bar{C}$ is a tree-like (λ,κ)-ladder system then $\mathrm{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$.
3) Assume $\theta > \kappa, \lambda \geq \chi$ are regular cardinals and $\chi \in \mathfrak{D}_{\theta,\kappa}$. If $\mathrm{OBB}_\chi(\bar{C}, I), I$ is θ^+-complete, $\lambda(\bar{C}) = \lambda$ and $\kappa(\bar{C}) = \kappa$ then $\mathrm{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$.
4) If $\theta > \sigma$ are regular cardinals then $\mathrm{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta,\sigma}) > \theta \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta,\sigma}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{\theta,\sigma}$ and $\mathrm{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta,<\sigma}) \notin [\sigma,\theta]$ and $\mathrm{cf}(\mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{inc}}_{\theta,\sigma}) \notin \theta^+ \cap \mathrm{Reg}\backslash\{\sigma\}$.

Remark 1.19. 1) Assume $\theta_0 = 2^{\aleph_0} = \mathrm{cf}(2^{\aleph_0}), \theta_{n+1} = \mathfrak{d}_{\theta_n,\aleph_1}$. Then we can use part (3) but $\mu = \sup\{\theta_n : n < \omega\}$ is not necessarily strong limit. We can consider $\langle \theta_i : i < \omega_1 \rangle$ getting $\kappa(\bar{C}) = \aleph_1$. Do we get $\{\delta : \mathrm{pp}(\sum\limits_{i<\delta} \theta_i) = \mathrm{cov}(\sum\limits_{i<\delta} \theta_i, \aleph_1, \aleph_1, 2)\} \in \mathscr{D}_{\omega_1}$?
2) By [MRSh:799] we know that it is consistent with ZFC that: there is $\mathscr{A} \subseteq \mathrm{NS}_\theta = \{A \subseteq \theta : A \text{ not stationary}\}$ of cardinality $<\ \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{NS}_\theta)$ such that every $A \in \mathrm{NS}_\theta$ is included in the union of $< \theta$ of them.

Proof. 1) By 1.4(1) we have $\mathrm{OBB}_\lambda(\bar{C})$, by part (4), $\mathrm{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta,\kappa}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{\theta,\kappa}$ and by part (3) with $\chi := \lambda$ we deduce $\mathrm{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$ as promised.
2) Similarly.
3) Clearly we can find $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$ such that:

$(*)_2$ (a) $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \mathscr{F}_\varepsilon : \alpha \leq \chi \rangle$ is $\subseteq$-increasing continuous
(b) $\bar{g} = \langle g_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle, g_\varepsilon \in {}^\theta\theta$
(c) g_ε is a $(< \kappa)$-bound of $\mathscr{F}_\varepsilon$ for $\alpha < \lambda$
(d) $\mathscr{F}_\chi = {}^\theta\theta$.

As we are assuing $\mathrm{OBB}_\chi(\bar{C})$ let $\bar{t}$ be such that:

$(*)_3$ $\bar{t} = \langle t_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle \in {}^\lambda\chi$ is a witness for $\mathrm{OBB}_\chi(\bar{C})$.

For each $i < \theta$ let:

$(*)_4$ $\bar{t}_i = \langle t^i_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle \in {}^\lambda\theta$ be $t^i_\delta = g_{t_\delta}(i)$.

Let

$(*)_5$ $\mathscr{U}_1 := \{i < \theta : \bar{t}_i$ is not a witness for $\mathrm{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})\}$.

For each $i < \theta$ let (f_i, E_i) be such that

$(*)_6$ (a) $f_i : \lambda \to \theta$
(b) $E_i = S \bmod I$
(c) if $i \in \mathscr{U}_1$ and $\delta \in E_i$ then $(\exists \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \geq t^i_\delta)$ that is $(\exists \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \geq g_{t_\delta}(i))$.

Let $E = \cap\{E_i : i < \theta\}$ hence $S\backslash E \in I$. For each $\alpha < \lambda$ let $h_\alpha : \theta \to \theta$ be $h_\alpha(i) = f_i(\alpha)$ and $s_\alpha = \min\{\varepsilon < \chi : h_\alpha \in \mathscr{F}_\varepsilon\}$ so $\alpha \mapsto s_\alpha$ is a function from λ to θ. By the choice of $\bar{t}$ we have

$$\mathscr{W} := \{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(s_\alpha \leq t_\delta)\} \neq \emptyset \bmod I.$$

So we can choose $\delta(*) \in \mathscr{W} \cap E$. Now $\{h_\alpha : \alpha \in C_{\delta(*)}\} \subseteq \mathscr{F}_{\delta(*)}$ hence by the choice of $\mathrm{g}_{t_{\delta(*)}}$ we have

$(*)_7$ $\mathscr{U}_2 = \{i < \theta : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(h_\alpha(i) \le g_{t_\delta}(i))$ equivalently $(\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \le t^i_\delta)\} \neq \emptyset \mod J^{\mathrm{bd}}_\theta$.

Now

$(*)_8$ $\mathscr{U}_1 \cap \mathscr{U}_2 = \emptyset$

hence

$(*)_9$ $\mathscr{U}_1 \neq \theta \mod J^{\mathrm{bd}}_\theta$

hence

$(*)_{10}$ $\theta \backslash \mathscr{U}_1 \neq \emptyset$, i.e. for some $i < \theta, \bar{t}_i$ witness $\mathrm{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$.

This is enough.
4) First, we have to show that $\chi := \mathrm{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta,\sigma}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{\theta,\kappa}$ if $\mathrm{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta,\kappa}) > \theta$.

So let $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^\theta\theta$ be of cardinality $\mathfrak{d}_{\theta,\kappa}$ such that no $g \in {}^\theta\theta$ is a $(\le \kappa)$-bound of $\mathscr{F}$. Let $\langle \mathscr{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi\rangle$ be $\subseteq$-increasing with union $\mathscr{F}$ such that $\varepsilon < \chi \Rightarrow |\mathscr{F}_\varepsilon| < |\mathscr{F}| = \mathfrak{d}_{\theta,\kappa}$. Let $\mathscr{F}^+_\varepsilon = \{g \in {}^\theta\theta$: for some $\mathscr{F}' \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ of cardinality $< \sigma$ and $i_* < \theta$ we have $i_* < i < \theta \Rightarrow g(i) = \sup\{f(i) : f \in \mathscr{F}'\}\}$.

$\odot_1$ $\langle \mathscr{F}^+_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi\rangle$ is $\subseteq$-increasing.

Now we shall prove

$\odot_2$ $\cup\{\mathscr{F}^+_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi\} = {}^\theta\theta$.

Let $h \in {}^\theta\theta$, by the choice of $\mathscr{F}$ the function h is not a $(< \sigma)$-bound of $\mathscr{F}$ hence there is $\mathscr{F}' \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ of cardinality $< \sigma$ witnessing it which means that for every large enough $i < \theta, h(i) \le \sup\{f(i) : f \in \mathscr{F}'\}$. Let $\mathscr{F}' = \{f_j : j < j_* < \sigma\}$, let $\varepsilon_h(j) = \min\{\varepsilon : f_j \in \mathscr{F}_\varepsilon\}$ and let $\varepsilon_h := \sup\{\varepsilon_h(j) : j < j_*\} < \chi$ so clearly $h \in \mathscr{F}^+_{\varepsilon_h}$ hence $\odot_2$ is proved.

Lastly, obviously

$\odot_3$ g_ε is a $(< \sigma)$-bound of $\mathscr{F}^+_\varepsilon$.

Together we have shown that $\chi \in \mathfrak{D}_{\theta,\sigma}$. Second, why $\chi = \mathrm{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta,\sigma}) \notin [\sigma, \theta]$?

Let $\langle \mathscr{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi\rangle, \langle g_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi\rangle$ be as above. Let $g \in {}^\theta\theta$ be a common $<_{J^{\mathrm{bd}}_\theta}$-upper bound of $\{g_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi\}$, exist as $\chi \le \theta$

$\boxplus$ g is a $(< \sigma)$-bound of $\mathscr{F}$.

[Why? If $\mathscr{F}' \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ has cardinality $< \sigma$ then $\mathscr{F}' \subseteq \mathscr{F}_\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon < \chi$, so $\{i : (\forall f \in \mathscr{F}')(f(i) \le g_\varepsilon(i)\} \neq \emptyset \mod J$ but $g_\varepsilon \le_{J^{\mathrm{bd}}_\theta} g$, so g indeed is a $(< \sigma)$-bound of $\mathscr{F}$.]

But $\boxplus$ contradicts the choice of $\mathscr{F}$. $\square_{1.18}$

Remark 1.20. 1) We may combine OBB and the results of §2 (or [Sh:775]), e.g. see also 1.26 below.
2) Like 1.18 for $\mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta,\sigma}$, etc. (connection to Sep).

* * *

We look at relatives of OBB, though we shall not use them.
Other variants are

Definition 1.21. 1) $\mathrm{OBB}^0_J(\bar{C}, I)$ is defined as in 1.1(1) but we demand only $\{\delta \in S : \delta = \sup\{\alpha \in C_\delta : f(\alpha) \le_J t_\delta\}\} \ne \emptyset \mod I$.
1A) Assume $\mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) = \xi$ for every $\delta \in S$ and J_* is an ideal on ξ. We define $\mathrm{OBB}^0_{J,J_*}(\bar{C}, I)$ as in Definition 1.1, but we demand only that $\{\delta \in S : \ \mathrm{otp}(\alpha \cap C_\delta) : \alpha \in C_\delta$ and $f(\alpha) \le_J t_\delta\} \ne \emptyset \mod J_*\} \ne \emptyset \mod I$.
2) Let $\mathrm{OBB}^1_J(\bar{C}, I)$ mean $\mathrm{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$.
2A) Under the assumption of part (1A), we define $\mathrm{OBB}^0_{J,J_*}(\bar{C}, I)$ as in Definition 1.1 but we demand $\{\delta \in S : \{\mathrm{otp}(\alpha \cap C_\delta) : \alpha \in C_\delta$ and $f(\alpha) \le_J t_\delta\} = \xi \mod J_*\} \ne \emptyset \mod I$.
3) $\mathrm{OBB}^2_J(\bar{C}, I)$ when

- (a) J is a partial order
- (b) I is an ideal on $S = S(\bar{C})$
- (c) there is $\bar{t}$ which is a witness for $\mathrm{OBB}^2_J(\bar{C}, I)$ which means:
    - (α) $\bar{t} = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$
    - (β) $t_\delta \in J$
    - (γ) if $f : \cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \to J$, then the set $\{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(t_\delta \not\le_J f(\alpha))\}$ belongs to I^+.

4) $\mathrm{OBB}^3_J(\bar{C}, I)$ is defined similarly replacing $(c)(\gamma)$ by

- $(c)(\gamma)'$ if $f : \cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \to J$ then the set $\{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(t_\delta \not\le_J f(\alpha)\} = S(\bar{C}) \mod I$.

5) $\mathrm{OBB}^4_J(\bar{C}, I)$ is $\mathrm{OBB}^+_J(\bar{C}, I)$, i.e. is defined as in 1.1(1) but in the end $\{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f(\alpha) \le_J t_\delta)\} = S \mod I$.

Discussion 1.22. An example of 1.23(1A): $S = S^\lambda_{\aleph_2}, J_* = J_{\aleph_2 + \aleph_1}$ and we use a parallel of 1.5.

Claim 1.23. *0) Assume J is a partial order, $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle, C_\delta \subseteq \delta, \mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa, \kappa$ a cardinal (or ordinal), J_* an ideal on ξ, I an ideal on S.*
1) If $\mathrm{OBB}^0_{J,J_*}(\bar{C}, I)$ and J is $(2^{|\kappa|})^+$-directed, I is $(2^{|\kappa|})^+$-complete then for some $A \subseteq \xi, A \ne \emptyset \mod J_*$ we have $\mathrm{OBB}^1_{J,J_*}(\bar{C}, \bar{I})$.
2) For some $\mathscr{U} \in I^+_*$ we have $i \in \mathscr{U} \Rightarrow \mathrm{OBB}^0_{J_i,J_*}(\bar{C}, I)$ when below (a)-(f) below hold where

- (a) $\mathrm{OBB}^0_{J,J_*}(\bar{C}, \bar{I}), S = S(\bar{C}), \mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa$ *for* $\delta \in S$
- $(b) - (e)$ *as in 1.5*
- (f) (α) J_i *is σ-directed*
    - (β) $\bar{\mathscr{U}} = \langle \mathscr{U}_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{C})\rangle, \mathscr{U}_\alpha \subseteq \alpha, |\mathscr{U}_\alpha| < \sigma$
    - (γ) *if $\delta \in S, \bar{\mathscr{U}} = \langle \mathscr{U}_\alpha : \alpha \in C_\delta\rangle, \mathscr{U}_\alpha \in I^+_*$ for $\alpha \in C_\delta$ and $\alpha \in C_\delta \wedge \beta \in C_\delta \wedge \alpha \in \mathscr{U}_\beta \Rightarrow \mathscr{U}_\beta \subseteq \mathscr{U}_\alpha$ then $\cap\{\mathscr{U}_\alpha : \alpha \in C_\delta\} \in I^+_*$.*

3) Like part (2) but

- $(a)^+$ $\mathrm{OBB}^1_{J.J_*}(\bar{C}, I), S = S(\bar{C}), \mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa$ *for* $\delta \in S$
- $(f)^-$ *like (f) but in (γ) we hvae $\mathscr{U}_\alpha = i^* \mod I_*$.*

Proof. Like 1.5. □

Claim 1.24. *1) If J is linearly ordered, then* $\mathrm{OBB}^2_J(\bar{C},I) \Rightarrow \mathrm{OBB}^1_J(\bar{C},I)$.
2) $\mathrm{OBB}^1_J(\bar{C},\bar{I}) \Rightarrow \mathrm{OBB}^0_J(\bar{C},\bar{I})$ *and* $\mathrm{OBB}^1_J(\bar{C},\bar{I}) \Rightarrow \mathrm{OBB}^2_J(\bar{C},\bar{I})$ *and* $\mathrm{OBB}^3_J(\bar{C},\bar{I}) \Rightarrow \mathrm{OBB}^2_J(\bar{C},\bar{I})$.

Claim 1.25. *Assume that J_* is a σ-directed partial order.*
1) If $J_* = J^{\mathrm{bd}}_\sigma, \theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) > 2^\sigma, \sigma = \sigma^{<\kappa}$ *and* $\mathrm{OBB}^3_\theta(\bar{C},I)$, *then* $\mathrm{OBB}^2_{J_*}(\bar{C},I)$.
2) We can use any κ-directed partial order J_* of cardinality σ.

Claim 1.26. *In 1.11(2), assume we are given* $\langle (J^\xi, \bar{J}^\varepsilon, \bar{g}^\xi) : \xi < \xi(*) \rangle$ *such that*

- (α) $J^\xi, \bar{J}^\xi = \langle J^\xi_i : i < i(\xi) \rangle, \bar{g}^\xi = \langle g^\xi_t : t \in J \rangle, \bar{C}, \kappa, I$ *are as in 1.11(2) for each* $\xi < \xi(*)$
- (β) $\alpha < \theta \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{|\xi(*)|} < \theta$.

Then we can find a θ-complete ideal $I' \supseteq I$ such that for each ξ, for some $j_\xi < i(\xi)$, $\mathrm{OBB}^3_{J^\xi_{j_\xi}}(\bar{C},I')$ *holds.*

Proof. Like 1.11. $\square_{1.26}$

Observation 1.27. $\mathrm{OBB}^\ell_{J_2}(\bar{C},I)$ *holds when*

- (a) *J_1, J_2 are partial orders*
- (b) $\mathrm{OBB}^\ell_{J_1}(\bar{C},I)$
- (c) $f : J_1 \to J_2$
- (d) *for every $t^* \in J_2$, for some $s^* \in J_1$, we have* $(\forall s \in J_1)(h(s) <_{J_2} t^* \Rightarrow s <_{J_2} s^*)$.

Proof. Let $\bar{t} = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S(\bar{C}) \rangle$ exemplifies $\mathrm{OBB}^\ell_{J_1}(\bar{C},I)$.

For each $\delta \in S(\bar{C})$ let $s_\delta \in J_1$ be such that $t_\delta \le_J s_\delta$. It is enough to show that $\bar{s} = \langle s_\delta : \delta \in S(\bar{C}) \rangle$ exemplifies $\mathrm{OBB}^\ell_{J_2}(\bar{C},I)$. So assume $f_1 : \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{C}) \to J_1$ and let us define $f_2 : \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{C}) \to J_2$ by $f_2(\alpha)h(f_1(\alpha))$.

Let $W = \{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_2(\alpha) \le_{J_2} t_\delta)\}$. So $\ell = 2 \Rightarrow W \in I^+$, and $\ell 3 \Rightarrow W = S(\bar{C}) \bmod I$. Hence it suffices to show that $(\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)[f_1(\alpha) \le_{J_1} s_\delta]$, and hence it is enough to prove:

$$(\forall s \in J_1)(h(s) \le_{J_2} t_\delta \Rightarrow h(s) \le_{J_1} s_\delta).$$

$\square_{1.27}$

References

[Sh:g] Saharon Shelah, *Cardinal Arithmetic*, Oxford Logic Guides, vol. 29, Oxford University Press, 1994.

[Sh:420] ———, *Advances in Cardinal Arithmetic*, Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993, N.W. Sauer et al (eds.). 0708.1979, pp. 355–383.

[Sh:462] ———, *σ-entangled linear orders and narrowness of products of Boolean algebras*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **153** (1997), 199–275, math.LO/9609216.

[Sh:775] ———, *Middle Diamond*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **44** (2005), 527–560, math.LO/0212249.

[MRSh:799] Pierre Matet, Andrzej Roslanowski, and Saharon Shelah, *Cofinality of the nonstationary ideal*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **357** (2005), 4813–4837, math.LO/0210087.

[Sh:898] Saharon Shelah, *pcf and abelian groups*, Forum Mathematicum **accepted (provided changes are made)**, 0710.0157.

Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 91904, Israel, and, Department of Mathematics, Hill Center - Busch Campus, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

E-mail address: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

URL: `http://shelah.logic.at`